

Changes in the system of the discourse markers in New Testament Greek

Introduction

This study is related to our research on the Hellenistic Greek,¹ so that our basic methodology has to do rather with a diachronical approach. In so doing, however, our contribution to the study of discourse markers follows the main lines of contemporary syntax. The analyzed works are *Acts of the Apostles*, *The Shepherd of Hermas*, *Acts of Paul and Thecla*, *The life and miracles of Thecla*, *Acts of Xantippa, Polyxena and Rebecca*, and the letters of the apostles Peter and James. These texts are dated between the Ith and VIth centuries A.D., and every particular chronology will be later on dealt with. We will take as a reference Galen, an author of the 1st cent. A.D., and the pseudo-Lucianic *Timarion*, a Byzantine short novel from the 12th cent. A.D. We will not consider the matter whether Christian Greek must be taken as an autonomous dialect, and therefore plainly recognizable from other varieties of Hellenistic Greek.² Contemporary research simply uses to ascribe the so-called Christian Greek to the general Greek Koine, that is to say, there is no need to define it as a different dialect.³

¹ J. REDONDO, «De nuevo sobre la cuestion de las partículas griegas», in *Actas del VII Congreso Español de Estudios Clásicos I*, Madrid 1989, 261-266; ID., «Algunos helenismos en la Vulgata del Nuevo Testamento», in *Helmantica* 40(1990) (= *Actas del I Simposio de Latín Cristiano*, Madrid, Fundación Pastor, Noviembre 1987), 413-418; ID., «Precisiones a la lengua de los Moralia», in A. PÉREZ JIMÉNEZ – G. DEL CERRO CALDERÓN (edd.), *Estudios sobre Plutarco: Obra y Tradición*, Málaga 1990, 135-139; ID., «Un dato sintáctico sobre el Παράμυθητικός πρὸς τὴν γυναῖκα», in PÉREZ JIMÉNEZ – DEL CERRO CALDERÓN (edd.), *Estudios sobre Plutarco*, 155-158; ID., «The Greek literary language of the Hebrew historian Josephus», in *Hermes* 128(2000), 420-434.

² F. BLASS – A. DEBRUNNER, *Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Griechisch*, Göttingen 1965, 1; L. RYDBECK, *Fachprosa, vermeintliche Volkssprache und Neues Testament*, Uppsala 1967.

³ A. DEISSMANN, «Hellenistic Greek with special consideration of the Greek Bible», in S.E. PORTER (ed.), *The Language of New Testament. Classic Essays*, Sheffield 1991, 39-

The functions of discourse markers

The functions of discourse markers in late Koine cannot be analyzed by means of the modern theory on this word class without having in mind a main methodological principle: while researchers working in any modern language deal with data taken from the oral and written performance of the speakers, our scope is limited to the written issue of some oral uses, so that first of all we have to elucidate to what extent this issue happens, since it never will be completely equal to the oral use, and very often it looks like nonexistent. Therefore, sensorial imperatives, intellectual imperatives, rhetorical interrogation and indirect interrogation⁴ are not easily recognized as such in the Ancient Greek texts. The lack of the context where the linguistic act takes place – dramatic plays, among literary texts, use to provide a more suitable frame for this kind of research – makes hardly possible to outline the exact function of discourse markers.

Beinhauer certainly recognized the two main functions, phatic and appellative, of the class of words he used to call colloquial organizers – *organizadores conversacionales* –.⁵ Vígara Tauste suggests that some of these words or phrases – colloquial stimulators, *estimulantes conversacionales* in her own words – can be found not only at the beginning of the sentence, as Beinhauer established, since they also appear all along the sentence in order to keep the attention of our receptor.⁶ Actually, Juan de Valdés in 1536 and Diego Covarrubias in 1611 noticed the repetition of the discourse markers as a way to provide the text with the required internal coherence.⁷ There is a different ap-

59 (= A. HAUCK [ed.], *Realencyclopädie für protestantische Theologie und Kirche VII*, Leipzig 1899, 627-639); N. FERNÁNDEZ MARCOS, «En torno al estudio del griego de los cristianos», in *Em* 41(1973), 45-56; M. SILVA, «Bilingualism and the Character of Palestinian Greek», in *Bib* 61(1980), 198-219 (= in PORTER [ed.], *The Language of New Testament*, 205-226); T.E. EVANS, *Verbal Syntax in the Greek Pentateuch. Natural Greek Usage and Hebrew Interference*, Oxford 2001. N. FERNÁNDEZ MARCOS, «Hacia un léxico del griego de traducción», in *Revista Española de Lingüística* 9(1979), 489-504, describes the Christian Greek as a group language. The same conclusion is reached about Christian Latin by C. CODOÑER, «Latín cristiano, ¿lengua de grupo?», in *Nova Tellus* 3(1985), 111-126.

⁴ A.M. VÍGARA TAUSTE, *Aspectos del español hablado*, Madrid 1980, 60-62.

⁵ W. BEINHAUER, *El español coloquial*, Madrid 1929 (= 1978), 60.

⁶ VÍGARA TAUSTE, *Aspectos*, 61.

⁷ J. DE VALDÉS, *Diálogo de la lengua*, ed. R. DONÁZAR ASTIZ, Barcelona 1983, 136: «[...] pero esas otras particillas son bordones de necios. [...] Esas palabrillas y otras tales

proach in those authors who depict some discourse markers as interaction signals – *señales de interacción* –,⁸ as they replace the simple phatic function with the conative one – also called impressive, and recently known as *interactional*. Other interesting definitions applied to the discourse markers are *enfocadores de la alteridad*, alterity focalizers,⁹ and *marcadores de control de contacto*, contact control markers.¹⁰ Moreover, discourse markers have been assigned the possibility of expressing opinions and asserts that are similar in function to those expressed by full orations.¹¹ We will follow Fraser when he points up three different types of discourse markers, viz. contrastive, elaborative and inferential.¹² Already in the field of Ancient Greek syntax, several attempts have been made in order to establish a link between the syntactic function of the particles and their role in building up the coherence of the text.¹³ So, Oréal makes a case for the transfer of οὖν towards a use much more grammaticalized, in which the assertive function is replaced by the function of organizing the text, and that of

que algunos toman a que arrimarse cuando, estando hablando, no les viene a la memoria el vocablo tan presto como sería menester. Y así unos hay que se arriman a ¿entendéisme? y os lo dicen muchas veces, sin haber cosa que importe entenderla o que sea menester mucha atención para alcanzarla; por donde conocéis que no os preguntan si los entendéis por duda que tengan de ello, sino porque, mientras os preguntan aquello les venga a la memoria lo otro». S. DE COVARRUBIAS, *Tesoro de la lengua castellana*, Madrid 1611, 147: «Quando alguno tiene por costumbre yendo hablando entremeter alguna palabra que la repite muchas vezes y sin necesidad, decimos que es aquel su bordoncillo; porque entretanto descansa en él, y piensa lo que ha de decir».

⁸ B. LAMIROY – P. SWIGGERS, «Patterns of mobilization: a study of interaction signals in Romance», in R.A. GEIGER – B. RUDZKA-OSTYN (edd.), *Conceptualizations and mental processes in language*, Berlin-New York 1993, 649-678.

⁹ M.A. MARTÍN ZORRAQUINO – J. PORTOLÉS, «Los marcadores del discurso», in V. DEMONTE – T. BOSQUE, *Gramática descriptiva de la lengua española III*, Madrid 1999, 4051-4213.

¹⁰ J. PORTOLÉS, *Marcadores del discurso*, Barcelona 1998 (2007), 145.

¹¹ H. HAVERKATE, *La cortesía verbal. Estudio pragmalingüístico*, Madrid 1994.

¹² The function of the so-called contrastive markers consists of signaling that the utterance following is either a denial or a contrast of some proposition associated with the preceding discourse (B. FRASER, «What are discourse markers?», in *Pragmatics* 6[1996], 167-190, here 187); elaborative markers should signal that the utterance following constitutes a refinement of some sort on the preceding discourse (*ibid.*, 187-188); finally, inferential markers should be expressions which signal that the force of the utterance is a conclusion which follows from the preceding discourse (*ibid.*, 188).

¹³ E. ORÉAL, «Sur la fonction argumentative de quelques particules grecques», in *LALIES* 17(1997), 229-249; E. REDONDO MOYANO, «Estudio de γάρ como marcador del discurso (Pro corona de Demóstenes)», in *Minerva* 17(2004), 11-30.

τοίνυν towards parasyntactical uses.¹⁴ Regarding to the case of New Testament texts, when analyzing the use of δέ and καί at the *Gospel of John* Starwalt applies the concept of *mystery particles*,¹⁵ since both connectors should refer not only to the sentence they are embedded in, but to a more extended frame, viz. the paragraph or even a broader section of the text.¹⁶

The study of discourse markers in Koine Greek, and especially in New Testament Greek

There is a not scarce amount of studies, even complete books, on the matter of particles in postclassical Greek. It seems however a mistaken strategy to summarize the question, from a diachronical point of view, to a case of simple degeneration.¹⁷ It has also been suggested, as a parallel reaction on the side of the literary authors, that a frequent use of particles should be explained as an Atticist device.¹⁸ Both theories seem to us far from the truth, as it is easily understandable if we pay attention to the language of such a non-literary author as Galen, for there is a plenty of particles and even many new combinations and clusters, besides those taken from Hippocrates, Plato and Aristoteles.¹⁹

On the other hand, we take for untenable the asset made by Rydbeck in rejecting any presence of vulgarisms in New Testament Greek, as well as any link between this variety of the Greek language and that

¹⁴ ORÉAL, «Sur la fonction argumentative», 238: «À l'affinité particulière entre οὖν, peu représenté dans des énoncés à modalité jussive, et la modalité interrogative, s'oppose l'affinité de τοίνυν avec la communication d'une volonté». Again about οὖν, ORÉAL underlines its not-inferential, but clausal, function (*ibid.*, 237-238).

¹⁵ R.E. LONGACRE, «Mystery particles and affixes», in S.S. MUFWENE – C.A. WALKER – S.B. STEEVER (edd.), *Papers from the 12th Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society*, Chicago, IL 1976, 468-475.

¹⁶ E. STARWALT, «Connectors in Koine Greek: The Gospel of John», in *Conservative Theological Journal* 3(1999), 135-151.

¹⁷ M.E. THRALL, *Greek Particles in the New Testament: Linguistic and Exegetical Studies*, Leiden 1962, 39: «[...] The use of particles in the κοινή differed in several aspects from that of the classical authors. In part the difference may be regarded as a sign of linguistic degeneration. The absence from the κοινή of many of the classical combinations of particles is the most significant example of this process and may well be a symptom of the more general decline of the classical Greek civilization».

¹⁸ D.M. SCHENKEVELD, *Studies in Demetrius' "On the Style"*, Amsterdam 1964, 141.

¹⁹ R.J. DURLING, «Some Particles and Particle Clusters in Galen», in *Glotta* 66(1988), 183-189.

of the papyrus.²⁰ Had we accept this isolated character of New Testament Greek, it should be thought of as a written register (*Schriftsprache*) associated just to a professional use (*Fachsprache*). Actually, New Testament Greek shows many linguistic devices related to colloquial speech.

Finally, another research trend that seems to us unsatisfactory – not as a principle, but after the results obtained – explains many of the main characteristics of New Testament Greek as borrowings from a Semitic language – Aramaic or Hebrew –, including the syntax of particles.²¹

Our comment will first of all deal with the *Acts of the Apostles*, a work that uses to be dated at the second half of the 1st cent. A.D. It is beyond our present scope the matter of the alleged interpolations – maybe a full new redaction? – after Josephus' *Antiquities of the Jews* and *Jewish War*.²² Anyway, the *Acts of the Apostles* are firmly considered the most ancient text of the whole Christian literature. From the point of view of language, its lexis shows not high literary pretensions. The only frequent marker is ἰδοῦ, which appears in initial place (V 9 and 25; IX 10 and 11; X 21) and medial as well (X 17), besides the combinations καὶ ἰδοῦ (VIII 27 and XVI 1 initial; I 10; V 28 and

²⁰ L. RYDBECK, «On the question of linguistic levels and the place of the New Testament in the contemporary language milieu», in PORTER (ed.), *The Language of New Testament*, 191-204 (English translation of a chapter appeared in RYDBECK, *Fachprosa, vermeintliche Volkssprache und Neues Testament*, 186-199): «I do not see any really vulgar characteristics in the language of the New Testament (apart from very special things in the Apocalypse). To draw connections between the language of the really vulgar papyri and the grammatically correct Greek of the New Testament may be difficult» (201-202).

²¹ H.S. GEHMAN, «The Hebraic Character of Septuagint Greek», in VT 1(1951), 81-90 (= PORTER [ed.], *The Language of New Testament*, 163-173); R.J. DECKER, «Markan Idiolect in the Study of the Greek of the New Testament», in *New Testament Greek Language and Exegesis Consultation. Evangelical Theological Society Annual Meeting, New Orleans (Nov. 2009)*, available in pdf at NTResources, <http://ntresources.com/blog/?p=677> (in S.E. PORTER – A. PITTS [edd.], *The Language of the New Testament. Context, History, and Development*, Leiden 2011, 43-66, gives a more nuanced version of the Semitist theory).

²² J.T. TOWNSEND, «The Date of Luke-Acts», in C.H. TALBERT (ed.), *Luke-Acts: New Perspectives from the Society of Biblical Literature Seminar*, New York 1984, 47-62; S. MASON, «Josephus and Luke-Acts», in ID., *Josephus and the New Testament*, Peabody, MA 1992, 185-229; H. SCHRECKENBERG, «Flavius Josephus und die lukanischen Schriften», in K.-H. RENGSTORF – W. HAUBECK – M. BACHMANN (edd.), *Wort in der Zeit: Neutestamentliche Studien*, Leiden 1980, 179-209, suggests that both Josephus and the New Testament authors used common sources.

XXVII 24 medial), καὶ νῦν ἰδοῦ (XIII 11; XX 22 and 25, all three at the initial place), ἀλλ' ἰδοῦ (XIII 25, initial), and the very noticeable combination οὐχὶ ἰδοῦ: οὐχὶ ἰδοῦ ἅπαντες οὗτοί εἰσιν λαλοῦντες Γαλιλαῖοι (2,7, initial).

The presence of combinatory variants has been pointed up by researchers working on discourse markers in modern languages: «estas unidades tienden a combinarse con otro conector, unas veces como elemento inicial y otras como segundo elemento».²³ Moreover, it is known that many markers as ἰδοῦ – literally, *see* (imperative, 2nd. person) – are already deslexicalized,²⁴ as it is very often the case of other particles because of their grammaticalization.²⁵

This feature has been explained as a Semitism,²⁶ but it is commonly attested from Aristophanes onwards at least, cf. Ar. *Ach.* 366: ἰδοῦ θεᾶσθε; N. 818: ἰδοῦ γ' ἰδοῦ; *Ly.* 441: ἰδοῦ γε, etc.²⁷ As an example of the use of ἰδοῦ in Byzantine Greek, cf. the following sentence: καὶ νῦν ἰδοῦ σέσωσμάι σοι, φίλε Κυδίων, καὶ ἀπαγγέλλω σοι τὰμά (*Timarion* 47).

A very interesting feature deals with the so-called continuative γάρ, which in itself is a perfect witness of the loss of the two old functions of this particle, the assertive and the illative; it initially belongs to the class of the inferential discourse markers;²⁸ now γάρ, being far away from its illative function, has to do only with the textual coherence. Take as an example the following sentence: οὐ γὰρ ὥς ὑμεῖς

²³ M.J. CUENCA – M.J. MARÍN JORDÀ, «Verbos de percepción gramaticalizados como conectores. Análisis contrastivo español-catalán», in *Revista española de lingüística aplicada* 1 (2000), 215-237, here 225.

²⁴ Y. SOLANO ROJAS, «Los conectores pragmáticos en el habla culta costarricense», in *Revista de filología y lingüística de la Universidad de Costa Rica* 15(1989), 143-154, here 145; E. MONTOLÍO – V. UNAMUNO, «The discourse marker a ver (Catalan a veure)», in *Journal of Pragmatics* 33(2001), 193-208.

²⁵ REDONDO, «De nuevo sobre la cuestión de las partículas griegas»; E.C. TRAUOGOTT, «From propositional to textual and expressive meanings: some semantic-pragmatic aspects of grammaticalization», in W.P. LEHMANN – Y. MALKIEL (edd.), *Perspectives on Historical Linguistics*, Amsterdam 1982, 245-271; EAD., «On the rise of epistemic meanings in English: an example of subjectification in semantic change», in *Language* 65(1989), 31-55; E.C. TRAUOGOTT – E. KÖNIG, «The semantic-pragmatics of grammaticalization revisited», in E.C. TRAUOGOTT – B. HEINE (edd.), *Approaches to Grammaticalization I*, Amsterdam 1991, 189-218.

²⁶ W.H. GUILLEMARD, *Hebraisms in the Greek Testament*, Cambridge-London 1879, 35, on Act 1,10 καὶ ἰδοῦ.

²⁷ A. LÓPEZ EIRE, *La lengua coloquial de la comedia aristofánica*, Murcia 1996, 101-104 and 123-124.

²⁸ FRASER, «What are discourse markers?», 188.

ὑπολαμβάνετε οὗτοι μεθύουσιν, ἔστιν γὰρ ὥρα τρίτη τῆς ἡμέρας, ἀλλὰ τοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ εἰρημένον διὰ τοῦ προφήτου Ἰωήλ (Act. 2,15-16)

Other uses look to a certain extent unsignificant, for they are very common in postclassical Greek. Take as an example the functional merger of οὖν and μέν οὖν: γένος οὖν υπάρχοντες τοῦ Θεοῦ (...). τοὺς μέν οὖν χρόνους τῆς ἀγνοίας ὑπεριδὼν ὁ θεὸς etc. (Act. 17, 29-30, cf. 23,21-22; 21,1.4; etc. *Herm.* XXXVIII 6; LXXVIII 2).²⁹

We will now continue with the syntax of discourse markers in the letters of Judas, Peter and James. In this short corpus we find again the aforesaid continuative γὰρ, but because of the nearly oral style, which is much more simple, it appears in a much more mechanical way. This is an example from the second letter of Peter:

ταῦτα γὰρ ὑμῖν υπάρχοντα καὶ πλεονάζοντα οὐκ ἀργοὺς οὐδὲ ἀκάρπους καθίστησιν εἰς τὴν τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐπίγνωσιν· ὃ γὰρ μὴ πάρεστιν ταῦτα, τυφλὸς ἐστὶν μυωπάζων, λήθην λαβὼν τοῦ καθαρισμοῦ τῶν πάλαι αὐτοῦ ἁμαρτιῶν. διὸ μᾶλλον, ἀδελφοί, σπουδάσατε βεβαίαν ὑμῶν τὴν κλήσιν καὶ ἐκλογὴν ποιεῖσθαι· ταῦτα γὰρ ποιοῦντες οὐ μὴ παίσητέ ποτε. οὕτως γὰρ πλουσίως ἐπιχορηγηθήσεται ὑμῖν ἡ εἴσοδος εἰς τὴν αἰώνιον βασιλείαν τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν καὶ σωτῆρος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ (2Pt 1,8-11).

Our next work, *The Shepherd of Hermas*, could have been written between the last years of the 1st cent. A.D. and middle II cent.³⁰ The work presents a very simple literary style provided with a limited use of discourse markers: only γὰρ δὲ and οὖν are regularly used, in comparison with the other particles: for example, γοῦν and οὐκοῦν are just hapaxes (LXXIV 2 and CV 6). The already commented ἰδοὺ is also attested in both positions, initial (III 4; VII 4) and medial as well (III 4), as it is the variants καὶ ἰδοὺ, also initial (LXXXIII 1) and medial (XXII 5, 6) and ἀλλ' ἰδοὺ (LVI 4). In recognising this ἀφέλεια we must not forget that the syntactic patterns of the text are coherent with the trends which are usual in Hellenistic Greek, such as the scarce amount of co-

²⁹ A.T. ROBERTSON, *A Grammar of the Greek New Testament at the light of historical research*, New York 1914, 1151-1152: indeed, most of the instances of μέν οὖν in the New Testament are resumptive, not correlative or antithetical. Cf. BLASS – DEBRUNNER, *Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Griechisch*, 267; A.N. JANNARIS, *An Historical Greek Grammar. Chiefly of the Attic Dialect as Written and Spoken from Classical Antiquity Down to the Present Time*, London 1897, 410.

³⁰ J.A.T. ROBINSON, *Redating the New Testament*, London 1976, gives a later *terminus ante quem*, since it should have been composed before 85 A.D.

ordinated sentences by means of μέν and δέ (LXXXIX 2), μέν οὖν (XI-II 1; XXXVIII 6; LXXVIII 2), etc. Many items show this syntactic Koine frame, for instance the use of ἕως in time clauses expressing simultaneity (LV 2; LXI 2). In accordance with this approach of the language of the work to non-literary devices, the syntax of the discourse markers includes innovations such as the so-called inceptive ἀλλά:

ἀλλ' οὐ ἕνεκα τούτου ὀργίζεται σοι ὁ θεός, ἀλλ' ἵνα τὸν οἶκόν σου τὸν ἀνομήσαντα εἰς τὸν κύριον καὶ εἰς ὑμᾶς τοὺς γονεῖς αὐτῶν ἐπιστρέψῃς, ἀλλὰ φιλότεκνος ὢν οὐκ ἐνουθέτεις σου τὸν οἶκον, ἀλλὰ ἀφήκες αὐτὸν καταφθαρῆναι δεινῶς, διὰ τοῦτό σοι ὀργίζεται ὁ κύριος· ἀλλὰ ἰάσεται σου πάντα τὰ προγεγονότα ποιηρὰ ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ σου· διὰ γὰρ τὰς ἐκείνων ἀμαρτίας καὶ ἀνομήματα οὐ κατεφθάρης ἀπὸ τῶν βιωτικῶν πράξεως, ἀλλ' ἡ πολυσπλαγχνία τοῦ κυρίου ἠλέησέν σε καὶ τὸν οἶκόν σου καὶ ἰσχυροποιήσῃ σε καὶ θεμελιώσῃ σε ἐν τῇ δόξῃ αὐτοῦ (III 1-2).

It is not of course a case of hypophora (Gorg. *Pal.* 7-12; Antipho V 58; *And.* I 148 and III 14-15). Two examples of this rhetorical device are indeed attested at this work: ἀλλ' αἱ διψυχίαι ὑμῶν ἀσυνέτους ὑμᾶς ποιοῦσιν καὶ τὸ μὴ ἔχειν τὴν καρδίαν ὑμῶν πρὸς τὸν κύριον. ἀποκριθεὶς αὐτῷ πάλιν εἶπον· ἀλλ' ἀπὸ σοῦ, κύριε, ἀκριβέστερον αὐτὰ γνωσόμεθα (XVIII 9-10), and οὐκοῦν μακαρίζετε ἑαυτοὺς; ἀλλὰ δοκεῖτε ἔργον μέγα πεποιηκέναι, ἂν τις ὑμῶν διὰ τὸν θεὸν πάθῃ (CV 6).³¹ Denniston certainly accepts the inceptive use of ἀλλά, but only if restricted to the stylistic level, and especially to the Xenophontean literary language; according with him, from a syntactic point of view this construction does not have any function.³² Our explanation of this syntactic device is quite different: in our opinion, it must be understood as a post-Classical innovation after the extension of the use of ἀλλά when reinforcing an imperative form, so that it was reanalyzed as an illative connector, viz. γάρ and οὖν. As a suitable way of explaining this device, it has been suggested an origin as a Semitism due to the process of translation of the Old Testament.³³ Yet the Greek origin, not at all Semitic, of this construction is proved by Galen: ἐφεξῆς δὲ διὰ βᾶθους, ἀρθέντων πρότερον τῶν ἀδέων τε καὶ τῶν ὑμένων καὶ τῶν ἀγγείων ἢ φορὰ τῶν

³¹ Regarding other New Testament texts, see Rm 5,7.

³² J.D. DENNISTON, *The Greek Particles*, Oxford 1934, 20-21.

³³ Cf. GUILLEMARD, *Hebraisms in the Greek Testament*, 56.

μεγάλων ἐστὶ νευρῶν, **ἀλλὰ** τοῦτό γε τὸ τοῦ δέρματος νεῦρον ἐπιβαίνει μὲν τῷ βραχίονι etc. (*Proc. anat.* III 3). .

An only passage attests another innovation, for the adverbial accusative λοιπὸν, *henceforth*, has the value of an inferential particle, so that its new meaning is *therefore*: ταύτην τὴν ἐντολὴν τοῦ κυρίου τετέλεκα· σκάψω **λοιπὸν** τὸν ἀμπελῶνα τοῦτον etc. (LV 4). The editor of the work, Robert Joly, translates *j'ai exécuté l'ordre du maître; maintenant je vais bêcher la vigne* etc. But the French translation of λοιπὸν as a temporal adverb should have been *dorénavant, désormais*.

Our survey will now deal with the discourse markers in *Acts of Paul and Thecla*. The language of this work – from now on *APT* –, which is placed between 180 and 200 A.D. approximately,³⁴ has to do with the less literary level of the language. Most of the text is given the necessary coherence by means of the connectors καί and δέ, including their paratactic constructions; on the other side, we find only four examples of μὲν οὖν (34, 39, 41 and 45), three of οὖν (17, 29 and 32), three of γάρ (37, 40 and 44), and a last one by means of τε καί (32). It could seem rather surprising that the non-literary connector ἰδοὺ appears only once (43). The reason of this slow rate is that its colloquial use does not fit with the narrative structure of the work. Actually, this only passage appears in a direct discourse. It could be even said that, as the text gets along, the author tries to raise the literary level of the work by means of the introduction of new discourse markers: first of all the author brings into play οὖν, afterwards μὲν οὖν, and finally γάρ.

There is another cluster which deserves our attention, the innovation ἔτι δέ καί, attested in the following passages:

καὶ οὐκ ἀπένευεν ἀπὸ τῆς θυρίδος, ἀλλὰ τῇ πίστει ἐπήγετο ὑπερευφραϊνομένη, **ἔτι δέ καί** βλέπουσα πολλὰς γυναῖκας καὶ παρθένους εἰσπορευομένας πρὸς τὸν Παῦλον, ἐπεπόθει καὶ αὐτὴ καταξιωθῆναι κατὰ πρόσωπον στήναι Παύλου καὶ ἀκούειν τὸ τοῦ Χριστοῦ λόγον (*APT* 7).

πᾶσαι γὰρ αἱ γυναῖκες καὶ οἱ νέοι εἰσέρχονται πρὸς αὐτὸν διδασκόμενοι παρ' αὐτοῦ ὅτι Δεῖ, φῆσιν, ἕνα καὶ μόνον θεὸν φοβεῖσθαι καὶ ζῆν ἀγνῶς, **ἔτι δέ καί** ἡ

³⁴ J.N. BREMMER, «The Five Major Apocryphal Acts: Authors, Place, Time and Readership», in J.N. BREMMER (ed.), *The Apocryphal Acts of Thomas*, Leuven 2001, 149-170, here 153; J.W. BARRIER, *The Acts of Paul and Thecla: A Critical Introduction and Commentary*, Tübingen 2009, 23-24.

θυγάτηρ μου ὡς ἀράχνη ἐπὶ τῆς θυρίδος δεδεμένη τοῖς ὑπ' αὐτοῦ λόγοις κρατεῖται ἐπιθυμία καὶ καὶ πάθει δεινῶ (APT 9).

ἐπιστράφηθι πρὸς τὸν σὸν Θάμυριν καὶ αἰσχύνθητι. ἔτι δὲ καὶ ἡ μήτηρ αὐτῆς τὰ αὐτὰ ἔλεγεν (APT 10).

A way of explaining this cluster consists of taking it as a semantic change, not at all a syntactic one, so that the temporal meaning *still* conveyed by the adverb ἔτι would have developed a second meaning, that of addition, i.e. *besides*. In our opinion, the syntactic change must also be taken into account because of two reasons, first of all the initial place of ἔτι δὲ καὶ and secondly the stable sequence of the cluster. Moreover, it must be said that all these examples are taken from narrative sections, instead of a direct discourse.

Another case of innovation deals with the exceptive function of the cluster ἀλλ' ἢ, which is attested at the so-called Coptic fragment:

ἐκεῖνοι δὲ θεωροῦντες τὸ παράδοξον θαῦμα ὥσπερ ἐν ἐκστάσει ἐγίνοντο, καὶ οὐχ ἴσχυσαν ἐπισχεῖν τὴν τοῦ θεοῦ δούλην ἀλλ' ἢ μόνον τοῦ μαφορίου αὐτῆς ἐπελάβοντο καὶ μέρος τι ἠδυνήθησαν ἀποσπᾶσαι (APT, fragm. cod. G, 52-55³⁵).

This cluster fits into the subcategory of the so-called *contrastive markers*.³⁶ Such a cluster is occasionally attested in New Testament Greek.³⁷ The explanation as a Semitism has been also attempted,³⁸ but the value is known from the Classical times on.³⁹ It can be also found in, for instance, Johannes Moschus.⁴⁰

A completely different literary text, *The Life and Miracles of Thecla* – quoted from now on by its Latin acronym *VMT* – is a work composed by two different sections, biographical and thaumaturgical, which was written towards the end of the 5th cent. A.D. In 1978, Da-

³⁵ R.A. LIPSUS – M. BONNET, «Acta Pauli et Theclae (partis finalis recensio e codice G)», in *Acta Apostolorum Apocrypha I*, Leipzig 1891, 271-272, here 272.

³⁶ FRASER, «What are discourse markers?», 187.

³⁷ BLASS – DEBRUNNER, *Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Griechisch*, 282, refers to Lk 12,51, among other examples.

³⁸ J. WELLHAUSEN, *Einleitung in die drei ersten Evangelien*, Berlin ²1911, 16-17.

³⁹ JANNARIS, *An Historical Greek Grammar*, § 1733.

⁴⁰ E. MIHEVC-GABROVEC, *Études sur la syntaxe de Ioannes Moschos*, Ljubljana 1960, 85.

gron suggested that the second section, which deals on the miracles of Thecla, should be placed between 444 and 448, some years after the composition of the biographical section and some years before two sets of additions, the first one between 448 and 468, and a second one between 468 and 476;⁴¹ more recently, Johnson suggests a datation towards 470 A.D.⁴²

Our analysis of the discourse markers shows a somewhat different structure of the text: the biographical section, as well as the first paragraphs of the thaumaturgical section – that is to say, the proemial section which leads to the exposition of the miracles of Thecla, which are told in a more narrative way – are composed in a literary Greek. In this literary section⁴³ the author is allowed to use discourse markers of plain Attic flavour, such as *φέρει δὲ καὶ* (*VMT* I 9; II 4). On the other side, not literary connectors are limited to the thaumaturgical section, viz. *ἡγουν* (*VMT* II 25), *ἥπερ* (*VMT* II 14) and *ἦτοι* (*VMT* II 28 *ter.* 41). The first one, *ἡγουν*, is qualified by Denniston as *a curious combination*, which according with this scholar is attested in the *Corpus Hippocraticum* and several late grammarians.⁴⁴ This is the example of our text: *Τὸν γοῦν ναὸν αὐτῆς ἡγουν καὶ πόλιν, καὶ γὰρ εἰς πόλεως λοιπὸν περιελήλαται καὶ σχῆμα καὶ χρεῖαν καὶ κάλλος, οὐκ ἂν εὖροις χωρὶς ἀστῶν ἢ ξένων ποτέ etc.* (*VMT* II 25).⁴⁵

The *VMT* is fond of discourse markers related to verbs expressing perception, the so-called sensory verbs; syntax and semantics are again coinvolved in organising the textual coherence of a text which is in some aspects very close to an oral frame. By comparison with the precedent texts analyzed, it is to be quoted the cluster *ἀλλὰ γὰρ ἰδοῦ* (I 9). Other interesting clusters are, for instance, *οὐ μὲν καὶ*, which has not

⁴¹ G. DAGRON, *Vie et miracles de Sainte Thècle. Texte grec, traduction et commentaire*, Brussels 1978, 17-19.

⁴² S.F. JOHNSTON, *The Life and Miracles of Thekla: A Literary Study*, Cambridge 2006, 5.

⁴³ See a fresh reassessment of the literary models labelled by the author of the work in A. NARRO, «Nouvelles réminiscences littéraires décelées dans la Vie et Miracles de sainte Thècle (BHG 1717-1718)», in *Analecta Bollandiana* 130(2012), 302-305.

⁴⁴ DENNISTON, *The Greek Particles*, 459.

⁴⁵ There is a variant lesson, *εἴτ' οὖν*, which in our opinion was introduced by a copyist with the aim of making better the text, given that the form *ἡγουν* looked strange for him. The textual principle of the *lectio difficilior* suggests that the lesson *ἡγουν* must be kept.

been recognized as such till now:⁴⁶ οὐ μὴν καὶ εἰδότες ἦν τὸν Παῦλον καὶ τὴν Θέκλαν τό γε οὕτως ἄτοπα καὶ δυσαγῆ κατ' αὐτῶν ὑποπτεύειν, οὔτε ἐφ' οἷς παρεκαθίζετο μὲν ἡ κόρη, διελέγετο δὲ ὁ Παῦλος (VMT I 10); and μέντοι γε, an *infrequent combination*:⁴⁷ (Denniston 1934: 405; see also Hoogeveen 1829: 112): Ἡ μέντοι γε Θέκλα, καὶ τούτων γινομένων, ἐκάθητο μὲν παρὰ τοῖς τοῦ Παύλου ποσίν, ἀκαταπλήκτω δὲ καὶ ἀπτοήτῳ φρονήματι τῶν θείων δογμάτων ἀπήλαυνεν (VMT I 10). The author shows a particular preference for this cluster, which is attested in six more passages, notably at the biographical section (VMT I 4, 9, 18, 19, 20, 26 and II 17).⁴⁸ A third cluster has to be also taken into account, viz. μήτε μὴν, which has also been neglected by the scholars:⁴⁹ ὁρῶ μὲν μηδὲν εὐγενείας σε μηδὲ Σεμνότητος ἀπολείπουσιν, ὦ κόρη, μήτε μὴν φρονήσεως καὶ σωματικῆς εὐπρεπείας, ὁμοῦ δὲ πάντα κεκτῆσθαι τὰ κάλλιστα, ὥς τῶν ὁρωμένων τούτων ἐμοί τε ἔνι καὶ τούτοις ἅπασιν στοχάσασθαι (VMT I 11). The coincidence of these three combinations at the beginning of the work argues for the literary programme of the author, as well as for the different trend of the two sections of the text.

Attention must be also paid to the inferential value of λοιπόν, already commented (VMT I 6; I 11) and largely attested in Byzantine Greek: ἄρξαι λοιπόν τῆς ἱστορίας, ὦ λῶστε, τοῦ ἡλιακοῦ φωτὸς ἐπιδαφιλευομένου σοι (Timarion 2); λέγε λοιπόν, ὦ φίλε, τὸν λόγον εἰς τὸν εἰρμὸν ἐπαναγαγών (Timarion 16).

We are much more interested in functional innovations. As known, in Classical Greek parenthetical clauses are either introduced by means of the markers γάρ and δέ, or asyndetically constructed.⁵⁰ However, our text includes a fourth syntactic variant, the parenthetical cluster καὶ γάρ. No one of the extant contributions to the study of the Greek particles picks up this parenthetical construction, which is certainly unknown in Classical times.⁵¹ Only Hoogeveen makes an interesting

⁴⁶ DENNISTON, *The Greek Particles*, 338-339.

⁴⁷ DENNISTON, *The Greek Particles*, 405; see also H. HOOGEVEEN, *Greek Particles*, London 1829, 112.

⁴⁸ The editor Dagron prefers to publish in both passages, I 9 and I 10, μὲν τοῖ γε.

⁴⁹ HOOGEVEEN, *Greek Particles*, 125; DENNISTON, *The Greek Particles*, 341.

⁵⁰ Th. III 59, 3, with γάρ; Th. VII 13, 2, with δέ; Dem. XXII 5, asyndetical.

⁵¹ Matthaeus Devarius also concludes that καὶ γάρ «[...] aut coniunctivam vim habet aut emphaticam» (R. KLOTZ, *Matthaei Devarii Liber de Graecae linguae particulis I-II*, Leipzig 1835, II, 642). There is an only exception which seems not to follow the pattern of a parenthetical clause. At Th. III 5, 4 Classen and Steup present a parenthetical clause

observation: «καὶ γάρ is used in the same elliptical manner as γάρ alone [...]. Sometimes the ellipsis is to be supplied, not with any preceding words, but by something extrinsecal».⁵² The examples of this parenthetical καὶ γάρ in *VMT* are the following:

Τοῦτο φόβου μὲν πολλοῦ καὶ πτοήσεως τὴν πόλιν ἅμα ἐπληρώσε – καὶ γὰρ εὐθὺς ἐξεβόηθη τὸ κακόν – δείματος δὲ ἐξαισίου τὸν δικαστήν (*VMT* I 21).

As a parallel example in New Testament Greek, see this fragment of the *Acts of Paul*:

Ἰως ἐλθὼν κατὰ τὴν παράθυρον τοῦ σταδίου καθ' ἣν Παῦλος ἐκέκλιστο, ἐβόησεν μεγάλως, ὥστε πάντα βοᾶν· ὁ λέων, καὶ γὰρ ὀρύετο πικρῶς, καὶ ἐμβριμῶς ὥστε καὶ Παῦλον ἐμπεσὶν τῆς προσευχῆς διλωθέντα.

The papyrus seems not to have been carefully edited, so that in our opinion the correct understanding of the text should benefit from the erasing of the upper dot after βοᾶν, so that the subject of the next clause be explicitly indicated. This should be the translation after this small correction: «Coming close to that window of the stadium on which Paul was lying, he roared a big roar – he bellowed in a gloomy and strong way –, so that Paul showed that he had stopped praying».⁵³

There is again no need to assert a Semitic origin. Take as an example the following Galenic passage:

ἕτεροι δὲ τῇ τραχείᾳ φασὶν ἀρτηρίᾳ βρόχον περιβάλλοντες ἐπιδεικνύναι κινούμενον τὸν πνεύμονα, μηκέτι προσθέντες οἷς λέγουσιν ἢ διαγράφουσι, καὶ γὰρ καὶ γέγραπται πρὸς τινῶν ταῦτα, πῶς ἐθεάσαντο συστελλόμενον τὸν πνεύμονα, πότερον ἄνευ τοῦ συντρηθῆναι κατὰ τὸν θώρακα τὸ ζῶον, ἢ συντρηθέντος (*Proc. anat.* VII 14).

Our next work, the *Acts of Xantippa, Polyxena and Rebecca*, could have been written towards the IIIrd cent. A.D. according with Mon-

introduced by means of καὶ γάρ, but they do not afford any syntactical reason (J. CLASSEN – J. STEUP, *Thukydides III*, Berlin 1963, 9). On the other side, this Thucydidean passage is a digression of a rather considerable extent, instead of a secondary information that can be given by means of a parenthetical clause.

⁵² HOOGEVEEN, *Greek Particles*, 88; see also the same statement about γάρ, p. 28.

⁵³ As an alternative explanation, the cluster καὶ γὰρ could also be analyzed as a marker of the beginning of the clause.

tague.⁵⁴ Hadas suggests a more extended period covering the IIIrd and IVth centuries A.D.,⁵⁵ while the most recent research points to the VIth cent. A.D.⁵⁶ The work shows a rather restricted use of the discourse markers, not only because of their low frequency, but also because of the small number of functions that they fulfill. Two particles, οὖν and γάρ, are very frequent indeed, but their use does not convey a literary colour to the text.⁵⁷ Other discourse markers are even more colloquial, such as ἰδοῦ (XVIII, XXI, XXII, XXV, XXVII, XXXV) and its cluster variants ἰδοῦ καὶ γάρ (XXIV), ἰδοῦ γάρ (XVIII), and especially καὶ ἰδοῦ, which is very often attested (XVII, XXI, XXII, XXIV, XXV, XXX, XXXI, XXXIII, XXXV, XXXIX). Other discourse markers are λοιπόν (XVIII and XXIX), πλήν and γοῦν; nevertheless, their use is quite different, not only because of their respective meanings: πλήν is attested twice in direct discourse (VIII: ἄνθρωπε, ὅστις εἰ οὐκ οἶδα· **πλήν** καταξίωσον ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ μου εἰσελθεῖν, and XXII: ὄντως μεγάλως ἔχεις θλιβῆναι, ἀδελφή μου Πολυξένη· **πλήν** ἔχει σε ἰδίαν ὁ θεός, ὅτι ἔδειξέν σοι ξένα καὶ θαυμάσια; also in direct discourse in the Byzantine *Timarion*, cf. **πλήν ἀλλὰ** πεφροimiάσθω μοι τὰ Εὐριπίδεια (*Timarion* 1), and γοῦν appears once in a narrative context (XXII: μετὰ **γοῦν** τὸ δειπνον προῆλθεν ὁ Πρόβος πρὸς ἀκρόασιν τοῦ λόγου).

The concessive meaning of καίτοι and καίτοιγε is well attested in New Testament Greek (Jn 4,1-2: Ὡς οὖν ἔγνω ὁ Ἰησοῦς ὅτι ἤκουσαν οἱ Φαρισαῖοι ὅτι Ἰησοῦς πλείονας μαθητὰς ποιεῖ καὶ βαπτίζει ἢ Ἰωάννης – καίτοιγε Ἰησοῦς αὐτὸς οὐκ ἐβάπτισεν ἀλλ' οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ – ἀφῆκεν τὴν Ἰουδαίαν καὶ ἀπῆλθεν πάλιν εἰς τὴν Γαλιλαίαν). The Galenic corpus witnesses that this a perfectly Greek use: ὅπου γε ὁ Μαρύλλου τοῦ μιμογράφου παῖς ἐθεραπεύθη καὶ ζῆ νῦν ἔτι, **καίτοι** γυμνωθείσης αὐτῷ

⁵⁴ R.J. MONTAGUE (ed.), *Apocrypha Anecdota: A Collection of Thirteen Books and Fragments*, Cambridge 1893, 54. His suggestion is followed by W.A. CRAIGIE, «The Acts of Xanthippe and Polyxena», in A. MENZIES (ed.), *Ante-Nicene Christian Library IX. Recently Discovered Additions to Early Christian Literature*, Edinburgh 1897, 275-292, here 275.

⁵⁵ M. HADAS, *Three Greek Romances*, Indianapolis, IN 1953, XIII.

⁵⁶ T. SZEPESSY, «Narrative Model of the Acta Xanthippae et Polyxena», in *Acta Antiqua Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* 44(2004), 317-340.

⁵⁷ The examples of ἐπεὶ have no interest for this paper, since in both cases it is used as a causal marker, not as an inferential marker (XXV: ἐάσατέ με οὕτως δι' αὐτὴν ἀποθανεῖν· ἴσως καὶ ἐν τούτῳ πληροφορηθῇ ὁ δοῦλος τοῦ Χριστοῦ Φίλιππος· ἐπεὶ εὐρεθήσομαι ὡς καταφρονήσας αὐτοῦ τῆς ἐντολῆς, εἰ μὴ ὅτι προσέκειτό μοι ἡ θλίψις αὕτη, ἐπεὶ ἐβλασφήμησα ἄν σε).

ποτε τῆς καρδίας (Gal. *Proc. anat.* VII 12). Nonetheless, the most frequent variant in Galen seems to be καίτοι γε, as in the following example: συνήπται δι' αὐτῶν καὶ ἥνωται τὰ πέρατα, καὶ διὰ τοῦτο ἓνα μὴν τίθενται τοῦτον οἱ ἀνατομικοὶ, **καίτοι γε** δύο κεφαλὰς ἔχει, καθάπερ οἱ μείζους αὐτῶν οἱ ἐπιπολῆς, οἱ τὸν εὐρωστότατον γεννῶντες τένοντα, περὶ ὧν ἄρτι διηλθον (Gal. *Proc. anat.* II 5).

This same device is of course attested in later Greek: καὶ ἅμα εἶδον καὶ πρὸς τὸ καινὸν ἐπεπήγειν τῆς θεάς καὶ τὴν φωνὴν ἐπειχόμεν, **καίτοι** λίαν ἐντείνας, αὐτὴν τε τὴν φωνητικὴν ὀργάνωσιν ἀκίνητον ἔφερον (*Timarion* 13). Anyway, probably the following example will show even better the cluster already commented regarding the New Testament texts and Galen: ἵνα καὶ συλλήβδην ἐρῶ, σατραπικαῖς δεξιώσεσι καὶ χορηγίαις ἡμᾶς ἐφωδίασε, φιλοσόφως **καίτοι γε** καὶ αὐχμηρῶς ἐσταλμένους (*Timarion* 2).

Finally, the *Life of Zosimus* is a short text written in a non-literary style and clearly intended to be applied to the oral predication. The editor, Montague, suggests a date not before the 5th or 6th cent. A.D.⁵⁸ Among other discourse markers already commented in the former works analyzed, we will underline another innovation, the use of ἀλλ' ἢ instead of πλὴν:

οὐ γὰρ δύναται ὁ ἄνθρωπος τὰ ὕδατά μου διακόψαι, **ἀλλ' ἢ** κατανόησον ἄνω τῶν ὑδάτων ἕως τοῦ οὐρανοῦ (*Vit. Zos.* II).⁵⁹

Conclusions

To begin with, the New Testament Greek shows the same kind of linguistic phenomena that characterize the Greek Koine, without any sign of a special syntax own to it; cases where a Semitic influence has been alleged have evident parallels in Greek authors in which there is no room for this theory. Second, discourse markers are always chosen and used according with the language of the text; their differences have to be explained by literary and sociolinguistic reasons. And third, the syntax of discourse markers in New Testament Greek shows some innovations: the use of καὶ γάρ as a marker of parenthetical clauses; both

⁵⁸ MONTAGUE (ed.), *Apocrypha Anecdota*, 95.

⁵⁹ MONTAGUE (ed.), *Apocrypha Anecdota*, 97.

the inceptive and the exceptive meaning of ἀλλά; the exceptive meaning of ἀλλ' ἦ; and the use of the cluster ἔτι δὲ καὶ as a discourse marker.

In the analyzed corpus there is no sign of the so-called *pause markers*, that is to say, those which are mainly related to the phatic function and of course used only in a plain oral situation. This absence makes clear that the New Testament texts mostly reflect a second grade orality, for even the short dialogues embedded are rather far from daily speech.

JORDI REDONDO
Universitat de València
Passeig Blasco Ibáñez 32
46010 València
País Valencià – Spagna
Jordi.Redondo@uv.es

Parole chiave

Marcatori discorsivi – Greco Biblico – Innovazioni

Keywords

Discourse markers – Biblical Greek – Innovations

Sommario

Questo articolo presenta un'analisi dell'impiego dei marcatori discorsivi – particelle nella tradizione della grammatica greca – in testi del periodo tra i secoli I e V d.C. Una ricerca diacronica permette di sottolineare i cambiamenti, sia funzionali che formali, che caratterizzano ciascuno dei testi elencati. Le loro differenze vanno discusse secondo la datazione dell'opera, il genere letterario e l'influenza dell'oralità. Lo studio considera la possibilità dei prestiti semitici come strumento nel processo di traduzione dei testi oppure come testimonianza di contatti linguistici.

Summary

This paper presents an analysis of the use of discourse markers – particles in the Greek grammatical tradition – in New Testament texts from a period between the 1st and VIth Cent. A.D. A diachronical research allows to underline the changes, both functional and formal, which feature each one of the selected texts. Their differences are discussed according with the date, the literary genre and the influence of orality. The study considers the possibility of Semitic borrowings as an instrument within the process of translating these texts, and as a witness of the linguistic contact as well.